

Appl. No. 10/044,720  
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006  
Supplemental response to the Office Action of 03/02/2006

### **REMARKS**

The Applicants are submitting this supplementary amendment in response to the Office Action dated March 2, 2006 and subsequent to the Applicants' response with amendment dated June 2, 2006. The Applicants understand that the amendment dated June 2, 2006 has been entered.

In order to further prosecution of this case, the Applicants are submitting this supplemental amendment. This supplemental amendment returns the dependent claims of the subject application to the state they were in prior to the Applicants' June 2, 2006 amendment and places subject matter that was indicated as allowable into new independent claims.

The previously pending independent claims have been cancelled, without prejudice, and new independent claims, which all include the subject matter of previously pending claims 11 and 36 have been added. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Independent Claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Dependent claims 10-11 and 35-36 have also been cancelled, without prejudice. New independent claims 37-40 and dependent claims 41-44 have been added. By virtue of this amendment, claims 2-9, 13-18, 20-25, 27-34, and 37-44 are pending. This amendment has not changed the number of total pending claims or the number of pending independent claims. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Applicants wish to thank Examiner Nguyen for indicating the allowability of the subject matter of claims 11 and 36. Office Action dated March 2, 2006, page 6, paragraph 6.

Appl. No. 10/044,720  
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006  
Supplemental response to the Office Action of 03/02/2006

### **Examiner Interview**

The Applicants wish to thank Examiner Nguyen for a telephonic interview on July 7, 2006. In that interview, the Applicants and the Examiner discussed placing the subject application into condition for allowance by rewriting claims 11 and 36 into independent form.

### **New Independent Claims**

The Applicants have added new independent claims 37-40. Independent claims 37 and 38 correspond to previously pending method claim 11 and computer readable medium claim 36, respectively, being rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. New independent system claim 39 and independent apparatus claim 40 include corresponding limitations to previously pending claims 11 and 36. Support for new independent claims 37-40 is found in the specification at, for example, page 9, line 5 through page 16, line 5. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The Applicants assert that these independent claims satisfy the statutory subject matter requirement by producing a "useful, concrete, and tangible result" by, for example, "presenting the results as summary digests, wherein the summary digests comprise color-coded sub-elements of content based on the number of EOC containing that particular sub-element" as is recited by claim 37 and similarly for the remaining independent claims.

### **New Dependent Claims**

The Applicants have added new dependent claims 41-44. These dependent claims are corresponding claims for already pending claims. New dependent method claim 41 corresponds to system claim 16. New dependent method claims 42 corresponds to system claim 17. New dependent system claim 43 corresponds to method claim 6 and new dependent system claim 44 corresponds to method claim 5. No new matter was added by these amendments.

Page 15 of 18

Appl. No. 10/044,720  
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006  
Supplemental response to the Office Action of 03/02/2006

**Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103 – Ingle, Chang and Spaderna**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-30, and 32-35, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingle et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0138524) (hereinafter "Ingle") in view of Chang et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0050923) (hereinafter "Chang") further in view of Spaderna (U. S. Patent Number 5,687,131) (hereinafter "Spaderna").

The Applicants have cancelled claims 1, 10, 12, 19, 26, and 35, without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot.

With regards to dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 13-18, 20-25, 27-30 and 32-34, these dependent claims have each been amended to depend from one of the new independent claims 37-40. As discussed above, new independent claims 37-40 include the subject matter of previously pending claims 11 and 36, which had been indicated as allowable. Since dependent claims include all of the limitations of the independent claims from which they depend, Applicants further assert that dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 13-18, 20-25, 27-30 and 32-34 also distinguish over the cited references as well. Therefore, Applicants assert that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

**Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103 – Ingle, Chang Spaderna, and Bull**

The Examiner rejected Claims 6 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingle et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0138524) in view of Chang et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0050923) in further view of Spaderna (U. S. Patent No. 5,687,131) as was applied in the rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-30, and 32-35, and further in view of Bull et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0187726) (hereinafter "Bull").

Appl. No. 10/044,720  
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006  
Supplemental response to the Office Action of 03/02/2006

The Applicants have amended dependent claims 6 and 31 to depend from independent claims 37 and 38, respectively. As discussed above, independent claims 37 and 38 include the allowable subject matter of previously pending claims 11 and 36. Since dependent claims include all of the limitations of the independent claims from which they depend, Applicants further assert that dependent claims 6 and 31 also distinguish over the cited prior art as well. Therefore, Applicants assert that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn

### **Conclusion**

The foregoing is submitted as full and complete supplemental response to the Official Action mailed 03/02/2005, and it is submitted that pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection and reexamination is requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Applicants acknowledge the continuing duty of candor and good faith to disclose information known to be material to the examination of this application. In accordance with 37 CFR § 1.56, all such information is dutifully made of record. The foreseeable equivalents of any territory surrendered by amendment are limited to the territory taught by the information of record. No other territory afforded by the doctrine of equivalents is knowingly surrendered and everything else is unforeseeable at the time of this amendment by the Applicants and the attorneys.

**If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities that can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, or that in any way it would help expedite**

Appl. No. 10/044,720  
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006  
Supplemental response to the Office Action of 03/02/2006


**the prosecution of the patent application, a telephone call to the undersigned at (561) 989-9811 is respectfully solicited.**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account **09-0441**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 10, 2006

By:



Jeffrey N. Giunta  
Reg. No. 42,583